REMARKS

1. Title

The Office Action mailed March 26, 2007 objected to the title as not being descriptive. Applicant has amended the title to read "Method and Apparatus for Matching Tactile Sensation to the Contents of a Display." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the objection to the title has been overcome.

2. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as lacking insufficient antecedent basis for the terms "the user" and "the display device." Applicant has amended claim 8 to read "a user" and "a display device." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome.

3. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 13-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 13 as amended recites a "computer program stored on a storage medium." Additionally, claim 13 recites "the tactile sensation being applied to the user is based upon the input data received from the input device, in accordance with the tactile sensation control pattern." Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13 recites a useful, concrete, and tangible result. *See State Street Bank & Trust Company v. Signature Financial Group, Inc.,* 149 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 1998). Claims 14-18 depend upon independent claim 13. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections have been overcome.

4.   Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Goldenberg et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,636,197). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

The present Application describes calculating a relationship between input associated with an input device and a tactile sensation to be applied to the user in accordance with a disposition of display elements to be displayed on a display device when display screen data associated with that disposition of display elements is sent to the display device. The relationship calculated may subsequently be used to apply feedback or sensation to a user based upon the user's operation of the input device.

A.   Claims 1-7

Independent claim 1 recites a system that "calculates a relationship between the input data and the tactile sensation in accordance with the arrangement of at least one display element on the display screen at the time that the display screen data is sent to the display device." The cited portions of Goldenberg et al. (col. 2, ll. 30-40; col. 15, l. 62 - col 16, l. 41; col. 9, l. 65 – col. 10, l. 2) do not disclose calculating a relationship between input data and tactile sensation in accordance with the disposition of display elements in a display screen at the time that the display screen data is sent to a display device.

Rather, the cited portions of Goldenberg et al. only disclose that a "rate control mode is entered when the knob is moved to the border of the menu, where at least one undisplayed menu item is scrolled onto the display device at a rate determined by a distance that the knob is moved past the menu border." Col. 2, ll. 36-40. Additionally, the cited portions of Goldenberg et al. do not disclose that feedback associated with the rate control mode is based upon an arrangement of display elements at the time that the

10

screen data is sent to the display. For instance, the rate control mode is not calculated when an undisplayed menu item is scrolled onto the display (*i.e.*, at the time that the display screen data is sent to the display device). At that time, the processor merely turns on the spring rate control forces. *See, e.g.,* col. 22, ll. 17-34.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection to claim 1 has been overcome. Claims 2-7 depend upon claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

B. Claims 8-12

Independent claim 8 recites "calculating a relationship between input data from the input device and the tactile sensation in accordance with an arrangement of at least one display element on a display screen at the time that the display screen data is sent to the display device." For the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection to claim 8 has been overcome. Claims 9-12 depend upon claim 8 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

C. Claims 13-18

Independent claim 13 recites "calculate a relationship between input data from the input device and the tactile sensation in accordance with an arrangement of at least one display element on a display screen at the time that the display screen data is sent to the display device." For the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection to claim 13 has been overcome. Claims 14-18 depend upon claim 13 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

D.   Claims 19-20

Independent claim 19 recites "calculate a relationship between input data from the input device and the tactile sensation in accordance with an arrangement of at least one display element on a display screen at the time that the display screen data is sent to the display device." For the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection to claim 19 has been overcome. Claim 20 depends upon claim 19 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

SUMMARY

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and seeks allowance thereof. If for any reason the Examiner is unable to allow the Application but believes that an interview would be helpful to resolve any issues, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at (312) 321-4277.

Respectfully submitted,

/Timothy J. Le Duc   /
Timothy J. Le Duc
Registration No. 54,745
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200

Dated: June 7, 2007